



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/384,541	08/27/1999	DAVID D. TAIEB	52817.00110	7979

29315 7590 10/02/2002

MINTZ LEVIN COHN FERRIS GLOVSKY AND POPEO PC
12010 SUNSET HILL ROAD
SUITE 900
RESTON, VA 20190

[REDACTED]

RAHIMI, IRAJ A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2622	[REDACTED]

DATE MAILED: 10/02/2002

10/02/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/384,541	TAIEB, DAVID D.
	Examiner (Iraj) Alan Rahimi	Art Unit 2622

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 July 2002.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ . |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>10</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Applicant amended the independent claims 1,6 and 11 completely and made changes to other claims as well. Applicant also addressed the objections noted in the first office action.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed on July 9, 2002 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant stated that the claims rejected under 103 using Sonnenschein and Bamford et al. when taken alone or in combination do not teach or suggest all the limitation of the amended claims. Examiner disagrees and provides the teaching of the Bamford et al. in the 102(b) rejections and in combination with Chan et al. for 103 rejections as listed below in light of the amended claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 10, 11, 15, 16 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Bamford et al. (US patent 5,506,940).

Regarding claims 1, 6, 11 and 16, Bamford et al. 1. discloses a method of selecting a font to output a message, comprising the steps of:

Art Unit: 2622

creating a linked list of structures containing categories of information about available system fonts (column 1, lines 26-30) (coded font is the linked list);

evaluating characters of a message to match against the linked list (column 2, lines 33-45 & column 7, lines 5-18); and

traversing the linked list to output the characters of the message (column 2, lines 33-45 & column 7, lines 5-18).

Regarding claim 3, Bamford et al. discloses a method of claim 1, wherein the output comprises printing (column 2, lines 35-44).

Regarding claims 5, 10, 15 and 20, Bamford et al. discloses a method of claim 1, further comprising the step of generating a code page output corresponding to characters matched (column 7, lines 5-18).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2622

6. Claims 2, 4, 7-9, 12-14 and 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bamford et al. in view of Chan et al. (US patent 6,073,147).

Regarding claims 2, Bamford et al. does not disclose the method of claim 1, wherein the evaluating step comprises comparing each character of the message in a universal character set. Chan et al. teaches character identification using a more universal character sets like Unicode (column 4, lines 30-44). Bamford et al. and Chan et al. are from the same field of endeavor that is font matching. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person skilled in the art, at the time of invention to use Unicode characters in the Bamford et al. invention to standardize character recognition in multilingual applications.

Regarding claims 4, 9, 14 and 19, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 2, 7, 12 and 17, are applicable.

Regarding claims 7, 12, and 17, Bamford et al. discloses the system of claim 6, wherein the processor unit compares each character of the message in a universal character set to a set of available system fonts (column 7, lines 5-18). However, Bamford et al. does not discloses a universal character set. Chan et al. teaches character identification using a more universal character sets like Unicode (column 4, lines 30-44). Bamford et al. and Chan et al. are from the same field of endeavor that is font matching. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person skilled in the art, at the time of invention to use Unicode characters in the Bamford et al. invention to standardize character recognition in multilingual applications.

Art Unit: 2622

Regarding claims 8,13 and 18, Bamford et al. discloses the system of claim 7, wherein the processor unit tests the ability of each structure to express each character (column 7, lines 5-42).

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Contact Information

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to (Iraj) Alan Rahimi whose telephone number is 703-306-3473. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri. 7:30-4:00.

Art Unit: 2622

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edward L Coles can be reached on 703-305-4712. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9314 for regular communications and 703-872-9314 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3800.

AR

September 30, 2002


EDWARD COLES
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
ART CENTER 2600